UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/579,038	06/13/2008	Ryoichi Shimoi	040356-0587	4980
	7590 10/27/200 LARDNER LLP	EXAMINER		
SUITE 500	T NIVI	LEONG, JONATHAN G		
3000 K STREE WASHINGTO			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1795	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/27/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Comments	10/579,038	SHIMOI ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	JONATHAN G. LEONG	1795			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	ldress		
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowan	ice except for formal matters, pro	secution as to the	e merits is		
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	3 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) 1-13 are subject to restriction and/or expressions. 					
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access applicant may not request that any objection to the confidence of the	epted or b) \square objected to by the Edrawing(s) be held in abeyance. See on is required if the drawing(s) is obj	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ected to. See 37 CI			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the prioric application from the International Bureau * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Application ity documents have been received (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National	Stage		
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ite			

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. This application contains claims directed to more than one species of the generic invention. These species are deemed to lack unity of invention because they are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

The species of a fuel cell are as follows:

Species A, First Embodiment as shown in Fig. 3, boundary layer has conductive particles with less catalyst particles than in the catalyst layer, an airgap rate substantially equal in both layers, conductive particles of substantially equal sizes in both layers, without hydrophilic treatment

Species B, Second Embodiment as shown in Fig. 5, electrolytic membrane has a penetrating bore

Species C, Third Embodiment as shown in Fig. 6-8, separator with <u>meandering</u> shape

Species D, Forth Embodiment as shown in Fig. 9-10, separator with <u>linear</u> plurality of grooves

Species E, Fifth Embodiment as shown in Fig. 11, boundary layer has conductive particles with less catalyst particles than in the catalyst layer, <u>airgap rate less than in catalyst layer</u>, conductive particles of substantially equal sizes in both layers, without hydrophilic treatment

Species F, Sixth Embodiment as shown in Fig. 12, boundary layer has conductive particles with less catalyst particles than in the catalyst layer, airgap rate

less than in catalyst layer, <u>smaller conductive particles than in catalyst layer</u>, without hydrophilic treatment

Species G, Seventh Embodiment as shown in Fig. 13, boundary layer has hydrophilic treatment, has conductive particles with less catalyst particles than in the catalyst layer, an airgap rate substantially equal in both layers, and conductive particles of substantially equal sizes in both layers

Species H, Eighth Embodiment as shown in Fig. 14, boundary layer has hydrophilic treatment without any catalyst, airgap rate substantially equal in both layers, conductive particles of substantially equal sizes in both layers

Species I, Ninth Embodiment as shown in Fig. 16, boundary layer has <u>hydrophilic</u> treatment <u>without any catalyst</u>, an <u>airgap rate less than in catalyst layer</u>, and conductive particles of substantially equal sizes in both layers

Species J, Tenth Embodiment as shown in Fig. 17, boundary layer has hydrophilic treatment without any catalyst, airgap rate less than in catalyst layer, smaller conductive particles than in catalyst layer

Applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single species to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. The reply must also identify the claims readable on the elected species, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered non-responsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include

all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Page 4

Currently, none of the claims appear to be generic.

2. The species listed above do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, the species lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons:

As detailed above, all of the species each have special technical features not required by the other species. Therefore, said species are mutually exclusive.

3. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.

The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.

4. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JONATHAN G. LEONG whose telephone number is (571) 270-1292. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Basia Ridley can be reached on (571) 272-1453. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. G. L./ Examiner, Art Unit 1795 10/14/2009

> /Basia Ridley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795